

Remarks

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12, and 14-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, U.S. 6,115,159 (“*Baker*”) in view of Kubo Kiyoshi et al., Japanese Patent No. 57-173237 (“*Kiyoshi*”), or Product Brochure, “PCI RCI System,” Fiber Optic Extender for Camera Link or LVDS (AIA) C (“*PCI RCI System*”), and in further view of Hurwitz, U.S. 5,568,205 (“*Hurwitz*”), or Maruichi et al., U.S. 5,469,211 (“*Maruichi*”).

December 11, 2006 Office Action, at par. 3, pages 2-7. The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, U.S. 6,115,159 (“*Baker*”) in view of Kubo Kiyoshi et al., Japanese Patent No. 57-173237 (“*Kiyoshi*”), and in further view of Wakui, U.S. Patent 6,262,767 (“*Wakui*”). *December 11, 2006 Office Action*, at par. 4, pages 7-9. The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, U.S. 6,115,159 (“*Baker*”) in view of Kubo Kiyoshi et al., Japanese Patent No. 57-173237 (“*Kiyoshi*”), or Product Brochure, “PCI RCI System,” Fiber Optic Extender for Camera Link or LVDS (AIA) C (“*PCI RCI System*”), and in view of Hurwitz, U.S. 5,568,205 (“*Hurwitz*”), or Maruichi et al., U.S. 5,469,211 (“*Maruichi*”), and in further view of Nagata et al, U.S. 6,947,092 (“*Nagata*”). *December 11, 2006 Office Action*, at par. 5, pages 9-10.

The Applicant has cancelled claims 1-27 and added new claims 28-51. No new matter has been added. Independent claims 28, 44, and 47 clarify that the transmitter receives input baseband television signals from the television camera, and the input baseband television signals are not arranged in a frequency division multiplex format. Independent claims 28, 44, and 47 also clarify that the receiver transmits output baseband television signals to the television camera,

and the output baseband television signals are not arranged in a frequency division multiplex format.

Support for these two elements may be found at least at paragraph [0034] of the Specification: “*Rather than dealing with FDM formatted signals*, the present system operates directly with baseband television signals (e.g., composite, HDTV, SDI or other), thereby avoiding altogether the need for expensive and complex triaxial adapters at either end of the connection.” In the present invention, “baseband television signals designated BCA originate from the camera 48 and are coupled to the camera transceiver unit 46 via cables 50. The electrical signals BCA are converted to optical signal OBCA for transmission downstream on fiber optic cable 30 to the base station transceiver unit 38. In a similar manner, the base station transceiver unit 38 converts baseband television signals designated BCU originated from the video production facility 11...The BCU signals are converted to optical signal OBCU which is carried upstream on fiber optic cable 30. *Specification*, at paragraph [0034] and Figures 3A and 3B.

“To establish *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, *citing, In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *Id., citing, In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

The Applicant respectfully contends that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose “the input baseband television signals [from the television camera] *are not arranged in a frequency division multiplex format*”; or (ii) “the output baseband television

signals [to the television camera] *are not arranged in a frequency division multiplex format.*”

The invention in *Baker* processes “electrical signals CA and CU,” which are “conventional television signals typically *arranged in a frequency division multiplex (FDM) format of the individual video, audio, and control signals....*” *Baker*, at col. 3, lines 55-58.

As shown in *Baker* Figure 2, the CCU Interface Unit (reference 22) converts conventional electrical signal CU into optical signal OCU, and converts optical signal OCA into conventional electrical signal CA. With further reference to *Baker* Figure 2, Camera Interface Unit (reference 24) converts conventional electrical signal CA into optical signal OCA, and converts optical signal OCU into conventional signal CU.

These conversions are described in the *Baker* specification: “control interface unit 22 converts electrical signal CU received on triaxial cable 14A to provide optical signal OCU on fiber optic cable 30. The optical signal OCU is transmitted on fiber optic cable 30 to the camera interface unit 24 where it is converted back to electrical signal CU and coupled to the triaxial cable 14B and passed to camera 12. In a similar manner, the camera interface unit 24 converts electrical signal CA received from the camera 12 on triaxial cable 14B to provide optical signal OCA which is transmitted on fiber optic cable 30 to the control interface unit 22. The control interface unit 22 converts the optical signal OCA back to electrical signal CA for transmission to the CCU 10 on triaxial cable 14A.” *Baker*, at col. 3, lines 36-48.

Therefore, because none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose at least two elements of independent claims 28, 44, and 47, the Applicant respectfully contends that independent claims 28, 44, and 47 are patentable over the cited references. Dependent claims 29-43, 45-46, and 48-51 must also be patentable, since “[i]f an independent claim is nonobvious

under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, *citing, In re Fine*, 837 F.3d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned in Westborough, Massachusetts, (508) 898-1501.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brian M. Dingman', with a stylized, cursive script.

Brian M. Dingman

Reg. No. 32,729